

**From:** Roos, Maury  
**Sent:** Friday, June 17, 2005 5:03 PM  
**To:** Guivetchi, Kamyar; Dabbs, Paul  
**Subject:** Some comments on CWP Update

Hi Kamyar-

I have a couple of thoughts about the B-160 draft presentation and contents, based on what I heard in the Sacramento meeting a week ago.

It would be good to compute water demands for the three 2030 scenarios. You give a bar chart in the summary (page 5), projected people and ag acreage in Vol 1. I, at least, would like to see a statewide table of the numbers for year 2000 hydrology. It looks like we have all the pieces. And it would be good to show net demand totals too to compare with previous bulletins.

On the right side of summary page 5 is the total change plus overdraft. It seems like it would be appropriate to also show the reduction in Colorado River supply which would be the 5.3 minus 4.4 MAF for water year 2000 or 0.9 MAF. That too would be quite a slice.

You made a comment in your excellent summary of the Sacto basin regional work that a very large number shown on the chart for Delta outflow was required. It looked like over 10 MAF but I could not be sure. I was left wondering if you had inadvertently picked the total outflow, that required plus the excess when you were explaining that chart.

I am puzzled by the large reductions for present trends and less resource intensive scenarios for Tulare Lake region on page 4. That should have an explanation. Is there that much land going out, maybe due to overdraft, salinization, or is this an artifact of assumed greater farm efficiency plus some urban expansion? I would prefer to have the chart in net demand, so we get a better idea of the need for water resources. If the irrigated land hasn't changed much, then the depletion wouldn't show a similar drop. (I presume these were to the same scale in all regions; no scale is shown except South Coast, which would imply a reduction of 1.5 MAF in Tulare Lake region.) I would have expected more reduction in the Colorado River region, due to the fallowing in IID- but maybe that is limited to the first 15 years.

On another matter, I had been looking more at the Colorado River supply for the 3 historic years. The USBR made a revision (increase) of nearly 200 TAF in the calendar year diversions for the All American Canal from the figures published in their year 2000 report. The revised numbers are in an "R" section of the 2001 report "Compilation of Records in Accordance with Article V of the Decree of the Supreme Court of the United States in Arizona v California Et Al, dated March 9, 1964" which

was dated in 2002. Vern, you might wish to make some revisions in the regional tables; it affects 2000 and 2001, because of the October-November changes which aren't big.

From the reports, with the revision, my tally for the 3 water years is as follows, in TAF:

	WY 1998	2000	2001
Total Calif. net	4894.0	5344.5	5118.1
MWD net at Havasu	1081.4	1295.3	1261.2
Colorado R region	3812.6	4049.2	3856.9
Total in B-160 backup, V.3	4986.4	5349.0	5197.1

The top 3 numbers give credit of around 90 TAF (from 101 to 86) to California for a share of unmeasured return flow, which is shown in a footnote on the summary state table. Vern, you might check with the Colorado River board on how to interpret that. Does California get the credit or not. The reports give calendar year totals which are:

Total California net	5045.2	5359.2	5254.7
MWD net at Havasu	1073.1	1300.0	1250.5
Unmeasured return flow	92.0	100.9	86.1
Calif. diversions to match above WY table	4953.2	5258.3	5168.6

Have a great cool weekend. Summer is just a couple day off.

Maury